United Nations A/62/138

General Assembly

Distr.: General
26 July 2007
English
Original: English/French

Sixty-second session
Agenda item 112 of the provisional agenda*
Report of the Secretary-General on the Peacebuilding Fund

The Peacebuilding Fund

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The Peacebuilding Fund was established as an innovative mechanism aimed at extending critical support during the early stages of a peace process, immediately following the conclusion of a peace agreement, when sufficient resources from other funding mechanisms were not yet available.

The report provides an overview of the administration and management of the Fund, including its establishment, management arrangements and oversight structure, as well as an overview of contributions made to the Fund. As of July 2007, the Fund had received pledges and contributions exceeding 90 per cent of the US$ 250 million funding target from a broad base of donors, including many members of the Peacebuilding Commission. The operations of the Fund in the countries under consideration by the Peacebuilding Commission and coordination with other funding mechanisms are also described in the report. Finally, a set of lessons learned during the first year of operation of the Fund is provided, including suggestions to improve disbursement processes.

* A/62/150.

07-43933 (E) 150807 170807

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1	3
II.	Administration and management	2–19	3
	A. Establishment of the Fund	2–6	3
	B. Management arrangements	7–11	4
	C. Oversight	12–16	5
	D. Contributions	17–19	6
III.	Operations of the Fund	20–37	7
	A. Countries under consideration by the Peacebuilding Commission	20–31	7
	B. Coordination with other funding mechanisms	32–35	10
	C. Countries declared eligible by the Secretary-General for support from the Fund	36	11
	D. Emergency window	37	11
IV.	Observations and issues	38–45	11
V.	Conclusion	46–47	12
Annexes			
I.	List of contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund		14
II.	Summary list of approved projects in Burundi and Sierra Leone		16
III.	Members of the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group		19

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/287 of 8 September 2006, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit an annual report to the General Assembly on the operations and activities of the Peacebuilding Fund. The Fund was formally launched on 11 October 2006 and has been in operation since January 2007. This first annual report provides an analysis of the allocations made and offers some initial lessons learned in the process of setting up the relevant disbursement structures. Given that project implementation is still in its initial stages, it is too early to present an analysis of the impact the Fund has had on peacebuilding efforts in the countries in which it operates.

II. Administration and management

A. Establishment of the Fund

2. The General Assembly, in its resolution 60/180 of 20 December 2005, and the Security Council, in its resolution 1645 (2005) also of 20 December 2005, reaffirmed the request to the Secretary-General contained in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (General Assembly resolution 60/1, para. 103) to establish a multi-year standing peacebuilding fund for post-conflict peacebuilding, funded by voluntary contributions and taking due account of existing instruments.

3. During the first half of 2006, an interdepartmental working group was constituted to advise on the design of the terms of reference of the Fund. Leading United Nations practitioners in the area of multi-donor trust funds were involved in this process in an effort to apply best practices in trust fund management and to ensure that the scope of the Fund would not overlap with existing funding mechanisms. Simultaneously, extended consultations were held with interested Member States, including members of the Peacebuilding Commission. These discussions provided critical inputs to enhance the disbursement mechanism and devise appropriate governance arrangements for the Fund. After their endorsement by both consultative processes, the Secretary-General submitted the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund (A/60/984, annex) to the General Assembly on 22 August 2006.

4. The Fund was established as an innovative mechanism aimed at extending critical support during the early stages of a peace process. Its design embodies a number of key principles: (i) it is premised on the national ownership of a peace process; (ii) it is designed as a catalyst to kick-start critical peacebuilding interventions; (iii) it utilizes United Nations agencies, funds and programmes as recipients to support project implementation by national entities; (iv) it operates as a global fund but at the same time allows for a decentralized and flexible disbursement process at the country level. The Fund provides support under three distinct facilities: (i) to countries under consideration by the Peacebuilding Commission; (ii) to countries declared eligible by the Secretary-General; and (iii) in the form of project support through its emergency window.

5. The Fund is intended to be used in the very early stages of a peacebuilding process when sufficient resources from other funding mechanisms are not yet

available, immediately following the conclusion of a peace agreement. In specific circumstances, the terms of reference of the Fund also provide for it to have a role in later stages of a peace process, especially in countries which do not have established multi-donor trust funds or in which financing to meet critical peacebuilding challenges is lacking. As an integral part of the new peacebuilding architecture, the Fund is meant to assist all countries under consideration by the Commission, irrespective of their particular phase in the peacebuilding process.

6. The terms of reference of the Fund have provided a firm basis on which to establish a well-functioning disbursement structure. Valuable lessons learned in the process of operationalizing the terms of reference will be used by the Peacebuilding Support Office to consider modifications to the process and, ultimately, to initiate a full review of the terms of reference, if appropriate, after the first two years of operations.

B. Management arrangements

7. An important consideration during the development of the Fund's terms of reference was the determination of the most appropriate management structure to ensure the Fund was able to operate speedily in post-conflict situations, irrespective of the type of United Nations presence in the country. Various disbursement models were discussed, leading to a formal decision in May 2006 to delegate responsibility for the fiduciary management of the Fund to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), on the basis of its competitive overhead cost structure and of the operational experience gained by the Office in administering several large trust funds, such as the United Nations Development Group Iraq Trust Fund. Through a formal memorandum of understanding between the United Nations and the Multi-donor Trust Fund Office, dated 29 November 2006, the Office was given responsibility for the fiduciary management of the Fund, while responsibility for its programmatic aspects was retained by the Secretariat. Under the authority of the Secretary-General, the head of the Peacebuilding Support Office maintains overall management and oversight responsibility for the Fund.

8. The Multi-donor Trust Fund Office is committed to full transparency in its working methods and operates a dedicated website (www.unpbf.org) providing all requisite information on the operations of the Fund, including updated information on contributions made and deliberations on projects approved at the country level. Once projects are formally approved and submitted to the Multi-donor Trust Fund Office, it reviews and validates the submission and makes disbursements to the recipient United Nations organization within two to three business days. As projects mature during the implementation cycle, all financial and progress reports will be made available on the website. Narrative progress reports submitted through the Multi-donor Trust Fund Office will be consolidated by the Peacebuilding Support Office and presented to the Peacebuilding Commission from time to time.

9. The designation of UNDP as fund manager allowed for the use of management mechanisms of existing trust funds, such as engaging United Nations agencies to act as formal recipients of funds, who in turn entrust implementation of projects to local partners such as government counterparts and international and non-governmental organizations. This modality allows for a consistent approach to expenditure

accountability and takes advantage of the expertise of the United Nations system in strengthening national capacity.

10. The terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund also call for the use, in each country that receives allocations under the Fund, of a steering committee co-chaired by the Government and the senior United Nations representative in the country and comprising other stakeholders in the project review and approval process. While the terms of reference of the Fund stipulate that existing coordination mechanisms be used for this purpose, the Governments of Burundi and Sierra Leone set up their respective steering committees as distinct entities. In the case of Sierra Leone, it is closely linked to existing coordination mechanisms, while in the case of Burundi, there was no functioning coordination mechanism at the time. The creation of these steering committees required a significant investment of time and effort, and was viewed by some as an undue bureaucratization of the disbursement process that could delay implementation.

11. Indeed, the initial negotiations on the composition and scope of the steering committees were challenging and time-consuming, but both committees are now operating effectively and have assumed a broader role as forums in which to discuss the engagement between the country and the Peacebuilding Commission. The inter-ministerial steering committee in Burundi serves as an important platform to bring together government ministries, the United Nations and other stakeholders, such as bilateral donors and representatives of civil society, on matters relating to peacebuilding. The steering committee in Sierra Leone includes representatives of the Government, donors, civil society and the United Nations system and receives technical support from the existing working groups established as part of the country's poverty reduction strategy.

C. Oversight

1. Peacebuilding Commission

12. The Peacebuilding Commission forms an integral part of the Fund's governance structure and has a critical role in providing advice on the strategic focus of the Fund's resources in countries under the Commission's consideration, in particular through analysis of critical peacebuilding gaps. Because the Fund is not designed to address all peacebuilding needs in a comprehensive manner, it should be used judiciously as a catalyst to start up critical activities, thus complementing the broader peacebuilding agenda discussed in the Commission.

13. The Commission triggers the allocation process by declaring a country under its consideration eligible for support from the Fund. The terms of reference of the Fund suggest that this declaration should be made early on in the Commission's deliberations, to ensure that the catalytic role of the Fund can rapidly be brought into play in accordance with a priority plan developed at the country level but is also closely aligned with the discussions on peacebuilding priorities in the Commission. Burundi and Sierra Leone were declared eligible for support from the Fund during the Commission's first country-specific meetings, held in October 2006. The Commission further recommended to the Secretary-General, at the conclusion of its December 2006 country-specific meetings, that the funding envelopes for the two countries should amount to at least $25 million. While such a pronouncement is not specifically provided for in the Fund's terms of reference, it

was an important affirmation of the inherent link between the discussion in the Commission on resource mobilization efforts and the contribution the Fund can make in addressing immediate priorities.

14. Whereas the deliberations of the Commission clearly inform the selection of peacebuilding priorities for the countries under its consideration, this does not amount to a formal role in approving detailed expenditures of the Fund. Members of the Commission provided important clarifications about the relationship between the Commission's role and the Fund during their field visits to Burundi and Sierra Leone in the spring of 2007. In the months to come, it is expected that the Commission will discuss ways in which it could strengthen the potential catalytic impact of the Fund by helping to ensure complementarity with other financing mechanisms in order to sustain initiatives started by the Fund.

2. General Assembly

15. Pursuant to the Fund's terms of reference, the General Assembly provides policy guidance on the use of the Fund. It has also assumed an important role in supporting the fund-raising effort. Several contributions to the Fund can be directly attributed to the dedication of the President of the General Assembly in soliciting financial support from Member States.

3. Advisory Group

16. An independent advisory group has been appointed by the Secretary-General to provide advice on and oversight of the speed and appropriateness of fund allocations and to examine performance and financial reports. In March 2007, following two rounds of solicitations for nominations from Member States, the Secretary-General announced the composition of the Advisory Group: 10 eminent persons, from all regions, with significant peacebuilding experience. The inaugural meeting of the Advisory Group is scheduled to take place on 6 September 2007, when it will commence a review of projects under implementation.

D. Contributions

17. At the launch of the Fund on 11 October 2006, pledges amounting to US$ 140 million were announced, attesting to the strong commitment of donors to endow the Fund with adequate funding. By the end of July 2007, 34 donors had pledged a total of US$ 226 million and deposited more than US$ 142 million. The Fund has thus received pledges amounting to 90 per cent of its initial funding target of US$ 250 million.

18. The Fund has been able to rely on a broad base of donors from the United Nations membership. Significantly, a number of donors also agreed to make multi-year commitments while others have made second-year contributions, which will help ensure the long-term sustainability of the Fund. Given present funding patterns and expenditure rates, it is envisaged that a first replenishment exercise could be held during the first quarter of 2008.

19. The Fund has been designed as a multi-year pooled fund and contributions to it cannot therefore be earmarked for particular countries or for specific priorities identified in any given priority plan. This is a principle that is well accepted by

donors to the Fund. In discussing the scope of the Fund in post-conflict situations, Member States recognized that it should be able to consider projects in the security sector, which often constitutes a crucial component of effective peacebuilding efforts. Some donors have expressed concern about the extent to which their contributions to the Fund can be considered eligible as official development assistance (ODA), if used for activities which fall outside the definition of ODA stipulated by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Efforts are currently under way to arrive at a technical solution to this issue, without undermining the flexibility of the Fund to address all types of critical peacebuilding challenges, regardless of their ODA eligibility.

III. Operations of the Fund

A. Countries under consideration by the Peacebuilding Commission

20. The Commission formally declared Burundi and Sierra Leone, the first two countries under its consideration, to be eligible for support from the Fund on 12 and 13 October 2006, respectively. These declarations triggered the allocation and disbursement process, as stipulated in the terms of reference, and the two countries were thus requested to identify the immediate priorities to be addressed through the Fund.

21. At that time, however, both countries had already presented to the Commission elements of their priority plan for the use of their allocation from the Fund, in anticipation of formal endorsement of that plan by the Commission. The Commission agreed to use the four priority areas identified by both Governments as the basis for its engagement with the two countries, which reinforced the notion that these priorities should serve as the main framework for disbursement from the Fund. This arrangement created the perception that the peacebuilding priorities identified by the Commission and the countries under consideration were the sole basis for disbursement of Peacebuilding Fund resources, a confusion that arose from the fact that the two processes — the identification of the peacebuilding priorities by the Commission and the allocation of Fund resources — were launched in parallel. The relationship between the Commission and the Fund has since been clarified, particularly with regard to the Fund's role of focusing on immediate and critical priorities, within the broader remit of the peacebuilding priorities endorsed by the Commission.

22. In accordance with the terms of reference of the Fund, the requisite priority plans were developed in both Burundi and Sierra Leone by the Government and the United Nations Integrated Office, reflecting their joint assessment of the immediate peacebuilding priorities. Following the submission of the priority plans to Headquarters, a consultative review process was undertaken involving key Secretariat departments and the head of the Peacebuilding Support Office. The outcomes of that process were a formal endorsement of the priority plans on the basis of tentative cost estimates for projects and the availability of funds, and a recommendation that the Secretary-General determine the funding allocations for Burundi and Sierra Leone.

23. On 29 January 2007 and 1 March 2007, the Secretary-General announced country envelopes of US$ 35 million each for Burundi and Sierra Leone. With this announcement, authority to draw down from these envelopes was delegated fully to the disbursement structures at the country level, co-chaired by the Government and the United Nations.

1. Burundi

24. In Burundi, the steering committee held its first meeting on 29 January 2007 and, at the time the present report was written, had approved 12 projects with a total budget value of US$ 26.8 million in the four priority areas set out in the Burundi Peacebuilding Fund priority plan, namely governance, the security sector, justice and human rights, and land issues. Nine of these projects, amounting to US$ 15 million, have already been submitted to the Multi-donor Trust Fund Office of UNDP. These projects are being implemented by the national authorities in collaboration with the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), UNDP and the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB).

25. In the priority area of governance, the Ministry of Good Governance, the Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights and Gender, and the Ministry of Youth and Sports, supported by UNDP, UNIFEM, UNFPA and BINUB, are implementing four projects to reinforce mechanisms to combat corruption, to establish frameworks for dialogue and consultation among national partners and to reinforce community-based peace consolidation and recovery initiatives aimed at women and youth. In the priority area of the security sector, the Ministry of the Interior and Public Security, the Ministry of National Defence and Former Combatants and the Technical Commission for Civil Disarmament and the Fight against the Proliferation of Small Arms, together with UNDP and BINUB, are supporting the implementation of four projects to rehabilitate the barracks of the Forces de Défense Nationale, to disarm the civilian population and to fight the proliferation of small arms.

26. Working with the Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights and Gender in the priority area of human rights, OHCHR and BINUB are supporting efforts to set up an independent national commission of human rights and are assisting in launching its activities. In the same priority area, UNDP is supporting the Ministry of Justice on two projects to rehabilitate the justice system in the country by reinforcing its legal institutions. In the priority area of property and land issues, the National Commission of Land and Other Assets is working with UNHCR to implement a project to promote the peaceful resolution of land disputes.

2. Sierra Leone

27. In Sierra Leone, the steering committee held its first meeting on 3 April 2007 and has since approved seven projects with a total value of US$ 16 million. These projects are being implemented by the national authorities in collaboration with the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL) and the United Nations country team under the priority areas of good governance, security and justice sector reform, youth employment and empowerment, and capacity-building.

28. In the priority area of youth employment and empowerment, the Ministry of Youth and Sports is working with UNDP to support the empowerment of youth through the creation of decent and productive employment opportunities in small and medium-sized enterprises/industries. In the priority area of justice and security sector reform, the steering committee approved three projects to be executed jointly by UNIOSIL and UNDP in collaboration with national counterparts, such as the Office of the Chief Justice and the Ministry of Defence. One of these projects is in support of the Sierra Leone Police Force to improve its capacity to manage public order and to reduce crime by providing adequate, modern equipment and relevant training to the Operational Support Division and the crowd control units. This project is particularly designed to strengthen the capacity of Sierra Leone to maintain law and order as the country prepares for and conducts its second post-conflict presidential and parliamentary elections.

29. Other projects in the same priority area are designed to provide support for the judiciary, the prisons department, the security agencies, the police and the army, including through the provision of assistance to improve operational and living conditions in the military barracks. The remaining two projects, to be implemented respectively by OHCHR and UNDP in the priority area of democracy and good governance, target the newly established National Human Rights Commission and support the activities of the National Electoral Commission in organizing the presidential and parliamentary elections to be held on 11 August 2007.

3. Other issues

30. Projects in the two countries are being approved by the respective steering committees in an incremental manner, depending on the speed at which detailed submissions have been prepared and vetted in a technical review. As of July 2007, close to 60 per cent of the combined total of the two country allocations has been disbursed for approved projects. Based on this rate of approval, it is expected that the funding envelope in both countries will be fully committed before the end of 2007. An active management of the project pipeline will further expedite disbursement.

31. The priority plans serve as the programming framework for the project approval process at the country level. During the early stages of deliberations in the steering committees, there was a clear trend towards considering only those projects which had previously been discussed in concept notes. More recent project approvals attest to the willingness of the steering committees also to consider projects which were not part of the original selection but have since assumed a degree of urgency and therefore require priority attention. In the case of Burundi, the parallel consultative process of developing the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding with the Commission allowed for the fine-tuning of priority areas. The area of property and land issues has, for example, been redefined to include socio-economic community-level recovery. Such flexibility in reviewing new projects will allow the Fund to focus on critical peacebuilding challenges as they arise.

B. Coordination with other funding mechanisms

32. The Fund operates in a financing environment which has seen significant innovation over recent years. Several new trust funds have been set up to support transition financing, while other funds have been modified to provide more extensive coverage across traditional mechanisms such as emergency relief and early recovery activities. Projects funded by the Fund need to be well coordinated with other mechanisms in order to avoid overlap and duplication of efforts.

33. The consultative process leading up to the approval of a priority plan at Headquarters has proved to be an important first step in clarifying the scope of activities under consideration and ensuring that planned projects under the Fund do not duplicate ongoing or planned activities of the United Nations, its agencies, funds or programmes. However, the principal coordination effort takes place at the country level, through the consultations leading up to the formulation of the priority plan and, subsequently, the project approval process managed by the steering committee. The participation of bilateral donors and civil society in the steering committee facilitates a broad coordination effort and has already inspired important additions to the process, such as the technical project review undertaken by the poverty reduction strategy pillar groups in the case of Sierra Leone. In Burundi, the experience gained through the work of the joint steering committee informed the establishment of an inclusive and integrated development partners coordination group to monitor the implementation of both the poverty reduction strategy paper (2007-2010) and the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding (2007).

34. In both Burundi and Sierra Leone, some donors initially expressed reservations about the value added of the Fund given the existence of ongoing multi-year assistance programmes that had been negotiated through bilateral framework agreements. Particular concerns were raised as to whether the use of the Fund would be consistent with the aid priorities agreed upon during consultative processes between the donor community and the Governments. In some instances, partners suggested that projects selected by the steering committee were of a longer-term development nature and were not an appropriate use of the Fund's resources. In Sierra Leone, deliberate and careful consideration involving all stakeholders was required in order to strike an appropriate balance between the desire for speedy disbursements and the need to ensure that the Fund is utilized for its intended purposes. In Burundi, agreement was reached on projects which, in addition to their socio-economic significance, have an added value for peacebuilding.

35. It is important to recall in this context that the Fund was not designed to reinforce existing development priorities but was conceived as a flexible mechanism to respond to early challenges to a peace process, as reflected in the Fund's priority plan. In countries at a more advanced stage of a peacebuilding process, this may indeed generate tension between peacebuilding priorities and broader development objectives. The steering committees provide an appropriate forum for resolving such concerns through constructive dialogue and it is hoped that partners recognize that the flexibility of the Fund in responding to immediate challenges should be kept in mind.

C. Countries declared eligible by the Secretary-General for support from the Fund

36. The Fund allows for the Secretary-General to declare a country in similar circumstances to those before the Commission to be eligible for support. This facility is expected to be activated in the near future for selected countries under consideration to benefit from both the strategic prioritization process leading up to the formulation of a priority plan and from financial support from the Fund. The review of potential countries is informed by a process of extensive consultations among appropriate departments of the Secretariat to ensure that such designation will generate a strong impact on the national peacebuilding effort.

D. Emergency window

37. The emergency window constitutes an immediate response capacity to address unforeseen challenges in an ongoing peace process. Under the Fund's terms of reference, the emergency window is intended to be a fast-track approval process and supports single-project interventions. At the time the present report was written, funding for a first Peacebuilding Fund emergency project was close to being approved, to support the mediation effort by the Burkinabe authorities in support of the peace process in Côte d'Ivoire.

IV. Observations and issues

Lessons learned during the first year of operation

38. While the Fund was developed as a rapid-response facility to meet immediate peacebuilding challenges, the actual process of setting up disbursement mechanisms in Burundi and Sierra Leone took several months to complete, causing some understandable frustration on the part of the recipients. In part, these delays were a function of the fact that both Burundi and Sierra Leone have well-established development and recovery frameworks in place, which necessitated a much greater coordination effort than would be required in an immediate post-conflict stage with fewer actors and shorter planning horizons.

39. Furthermore, the Fund is a new facility and requires an intensive process to ensure the establishment of appropriate disbursement structures. Important lessons were learned in this regard that will ensure that the lead time between the announcement of a country allocation and first disbursements can be shortened significantly in countries served by the Fund in the future.

40. Experience in the first two countries suggests that the scope of the Fund as an immediate response mechanism does not fit as neatly in a situation that has evolved several years beyond the highly fragile immediate post-conflict environment. In Burundi and Sierra Leone, considerable efforts were required to ensure full compatibility of the Fund with prevailing coordination mechanisms.

41. The Fund is starting to play a key role in sustaining the peacebuilding effort in Burundi and Sierra Leone, and is an important signal of the international community's commitment to providing sustained attention in order to reduce the

risk of a relapse into conflict. For other countries under consideration by the Commission, however, some modification in the disbursement process could be considered, especially for those countries which are no longer at the immediate post-conflict stage.

42. The Commission has control over the timing of the Peacebuilding Fund process for countries under its consideration, as an allocation can be made to such countries only once the Commission formally declares them eligible. Thus, one procedural modification that could be considered, particularly for a country at a more advanced stage of its peacebuilding process, would be to provide two distinct tranches under the Fund: an initial one to jump-start critical peacebuilding interventions immediately upon referral of the country to the Commission and a subsequent one to reflect the strategic discussions between the Commission and the country.

43. Members of the Commission have highlighted the need for more frequent updates on the operations of the Fund, including the sharing of information on disbursements, as well as for a more substantive analysis of how projects under the Fund contribute to addressing critical peacebuilding priorities identified in the strategic frameworks and how, as a result of this analysis, the Commission could best marshal resources to address any remaining gaps. This undertaking would need to be carried out in the context of a broader and more complex exercise of mapping and tracking overall resource flows to the country from all sources. This latter exercise will have a direct bearing on the mandated activities of the Commission and is worthy of considered debate.

44. The Fund does not impose extensive submission requirements, although the experience in Burundi and Sierra Leone has shown that the subsequent effort to set up a functioning disbursement mechanism can be time-consuming. Detailed information and improved guidance notes could be provided to countries serviced by the Fund in the future to shorten the start-up period. Some elements of the process could also be simplified, notably the requirement of developing concept notes to accompany the priority plan.

45. The Fund is meant to provide support to essential peacebuilding efforts undertaken by the Government and other national actors, which could include direct support to national administrations in order to rapidly build up national capacity. At the level of project implementation, better consideration needs to be given to the capacity of both governmental authorities and United Nations agencies to design, manage and implement projects under the Fund. This is particularly important because the Fund is designed to build up national capacity to sustain a peace process, an objective that can only be met with careful planning and dedicated implementation capacity. This would require some innovative approaches, including the possibility of supporting a national project implementation capacity with resources from the Fund, as is already being done in Burundi.

V. Conclusion

46. The Peacebuilding Fund is a new facility that has been in operation for a relatively short period. It is a financing tool that was designed to provide critical support to countries emerging from conflict but also operates in support of the strategic discussions in the Peacebuilding Commission. Although some

modifications to its disbursement process may need to be considered, the Fund continues to have enormous potential to make a critical contribution to peacebuilding efforts, to play a catalytic role in the early post-conflict period and to support the Commission's engagement with countries under its consideration.

47. With the forthcoming selection by the Secretary-General of countries eligible for support from the Fund, the Fund will be able to further demonstrate its value as a catalytic tool in post-conflict countries. It is expected that important linkages will be developed between the three facilities of the Fund. For instance, a country receiving initial support at the recommendation of the Secretary-General may subsequently become a candidate for longer-term consideration by the Commission. It is also anticipated that further consideration will be given to ensuring appropriate linkages between the Fund and other ongoing processes and tools in countries which receive support from the Fund.

Annex I

List of contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund

Peacebuilding Fund
Pledges, commitments and deposits, 18 July 2007

		Pledges[a]		*Commitments*[b]		*Deposits*
Donors	*Currency*	*Donor currency (thousands)*	*US$*[c] *(thousands)*	*Donor currency (thousands)*	*US$*[c] *(thousands)*	*US$ (thousands)*
Australia	$A	1 000	786	1 000	786	786
Austria[d]	€	1 000	1 327	1 000	1 327	1 327
Bahrain	US$	10	10	10	10	10
Belgium	€	2 478	3 264	2 478	3 264	—
Brazil	US$	20	20	20	20	20
Canada[d]	Can$	20 000	17 345	20 000	17 345	8 573
Chile	US$	10	10	10	10	10
China[d]	US$	3 000	3 000	3 000	3 000	—
Croatia	US$	30	30	10	10	30
Cyprus	US$	20	20	20	20	20
Czech Republic	US$	50	50	50	50	50
Denmark	DKr	50 000	8 879	50 000	8 879	8 879
Egypt	US$	20	20	20	20	20
Finland	€	1 600	2 117	1 600	2 117	2 117
France	€	1 000	1 359	1 000	1 359	1 359
Iceland	US$	1 000	1 000	1 000	1 000	1 000
India	US$	2 000	2 000	2 000	2 000	2 000
Indonesia	US$	20	20	20	20	20
Ireland	€	10 000	12 600	—	—	12 600
Italy	€	2 000	2 667	2 000	2 667	—
Japan	US$	20 000	20 000	20 000	20 000	20 000
Kuwait	US$	500	500	500	500	500
Luxembourg	€	300	393	300	393	393
Netherlands	US$	18 900	18 900	—	—	—
Norway	NKr	200 000	32 124	200 000	32 124	32 124
Poland	US$	50	50	50	50	50
Qatar	US$	100	100	100	100	100
Republic of Korea	US$	3 000	3 000	3 000	3 000	3 000
Spain[d]	€	5 600	7 449	—	—	7 449
Sweden	SKr	200 000	27 165	200 000	27 165	27 165
Thailand	US$	10	10	10	10	10
Turkey	US$	800	800	800	800	800

Donors	Currency	Pledges[a] Donor currency (thousands)	Pledges[a] US$[c] (thousands)	Commitments[b] Donor currency (thousands)	Commitments[b] US$[c] (thousands)	Deposits US$ (thousands)
United Arab Emirates	US$	500	500	—	—	500
United Kingdom[d]	£ stg.	30 000	58 686	30 000	58 686	11 811
Total		**US$ 226 200**		**US$ 186 732**		**US$ 142 722**

Notes

[a] Pledges: voluntary contributions by donors, pending formalization of letter of agreement.

[b] Commitments: contribution as per signed letter of agreement.

[c] US$ equivalents of pledges and commitments not yet deposited are estimated at United Nations operational exchange rates and are for indicative purposes only.

[d] Some donors have announced multi-year deposits.

Annex II

Summary list of approved projects in Burundi and Sierra Leone

Burundi

Burundi Peacebuilding Fund steering committee approval	*Burundi Peacebuilding Fund priority area*	*Government implementation partner*	*Recipient United Nations organization*	*Project title*	*Approved budget*
7 March 2007	Human rights	Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights and Gender	OHCHR	Support for the establishment of the Independent National Commission of Human Rights and launching of its activities	$400 000
20 March 2007	Property and land issues	National Commission of Land and Other Assets	UNHCR	Support for the peaceful resolution of land disputes	$700 000
29 March 2007	Security sector	Ministry of Interior and Public Security; Technical Commission for Civil Disarmament and the Fight against the Proliferation of Small Arms	UNDP	Launching of activities to disarm the population and to fight against the proliferation of small arms and light weapons	$500 000
29 March 2007	Human rights	Ministry of Justice/ Supreme Court	UNDP	Reduction of violence and elimination of the settling of scores by relaunching the National Programme for the notification and enforcement of rulings and decisions rendered by courts and tribunals, together with capacity-building for judicial institutions	$1 000 000

Burundi Peacebuilding Fund steering committee approval	*Burundi Peacebuilding Fund priority area*	*Government implementation partner*	*Recipient United Nations organization*	*Project title*	*Approved budget*
5 April 2007	Democratic governance	Ministry of Good Governance and General Inspection of the State and Local Administration; Ministry of Justice	UNDP	Support for the strengthening of mechanisms to combat corruption and misappropriation of funds throughout the country	$1 500 000
5 April 2007	Security sector	Ministry of National Defence and Former Combatants	UNDP	Rehabilitation of the barracks of the Forces de Défense Nationale to reduce the impact of the Forces' presence among the population	$4 583 000
2 May 2007	Democratic governance	Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights and Gender	UNIFEM	Rehabilitation of the role of women in the reconciliation and community reconstruction process	$3 000 000
10 May 2007	Human rights	Ministry of Justice	UNDP	Promotion and rehabilitation of the justice system to reduce conflicts within communities by building and setting up local courts	$800 000
13 June 2007	Democratic governance	Ministry of Good Governance and General Inspection of the State and Local Administration	UNDP	Support for the establishment of frameworks for dialogue and consultation among national partners	$3 000 000
Total					**$15 483 000**

Sierra Leone

Sierra Leone Peacebuilding Fund steering committee approval	*Sierra Leone Peacebuilding Fund priority area*	*Government implementation partner*	*Recipient United Nations organization*	*Project title*	*Approved budget*
11 May 2007	Justice and security	Sierra Leone police	UNDP	Improved public order management capacity	$1 042 564.91
11 May 2007	Youth empowerment and employment	Ministry of Youth and Sports, Youth Employment Secretariat	UNDP	Youth enterprise development	$4 080 906.92
22 June 2007	Justice and security	Human Rights Commission for Sierra Leone	UNDP	Capacity development of Human Rights Commission for Sierra Leone	$1 522 055.70
11 July 2007	Justice and security	Ministry of Finance	UNDP	Emergency support to the security sector	$1 822 823.94
11 July 2007	Justice and security	Office of the Chief Justice	UNDP	Capacity development of the justice system to prevent delays in trials and to clear backlog of cases	$3 959 772.54
11 July 2007	Justice and security	National Elections Commission	UNDP	Support to National Elections Commission polling staff	$1 598 727.36
11 July 2007	Justice and security	Ministry of Defence	UNDP	Rehabilitation of the water and sanitation facilities for the Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces barracks in Freetown	$1 955 706.00
Total					**$15 982 577.37**

Annex III

Members of the Peacebuilding Fund Advisory Group

1. Mr. Paolo Roberto Campos Tarisse da Fontoura (*Brazil*)
   Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations
2. Mr. Wu Gang (*China*)
   Deputy Director-General, Department of Public Administrative and Law Enforcement, Ministry of Finance
3. Ms. Nataša Mikuš (*Croatia*)
   Deputy State Secretary, Central Office for Development Strategy and Coordination of European Funds
4. Mr. Mounir Zahran (*Egypt*)
   Attorney-at-Law
5. Ms. Marjatta Rasi (*Finland*)
   Under-Secretary of State for Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
6. Mr. Yukio Takasu (*Japan*)
   Ambassador in Charge of Human Security and Special Envoy for United Nations Reform
7. Mr. Vidar Helgesen (*Norway*)
   Secretary-General, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
8. Mr. Joseph Mutaboba (*Rwanda*)
   Secretary-General, Ministry of Internal Affairs
9. Mr. Dan Smith (*United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*)
   Secretary-General, International Alert
10. Mr. Carlos Pascual (*United States of America*)
    Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy Studies Program, Brookings Institution